DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 839 FL 009 258

AUTHOR Hammer, Petra ; Monod, Madeleine
TITLE English-French Cognates: A Re-Examination.
INSTITUTION Alberta Teachers Association, Edmonton. Modern Language Council.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 20p.; Light type of this document may not reproduce clearly.
JOURNAL CIT Alberta Modern Language Journal; v15 n1 p23-41 Fall 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Distinctive Features; English; *French; High School Students; *Language Instruction; Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Tests; Language Usage; *Listening Comprehension; Phonemics; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Skills; Secondary Education; *Second Language Learning; Semantics; Spelling; Teaching Methods; Unit Plan; *Vocabulary; Word Recognition
IDENTIFIERS *Cognates

ABSTRACT

Following a brief review of the literature on cognates, and a discussion of six arguments in favor of using cognates as a vocabulary acquisition device, a study is described which was designed to determine whether students were able to utilize English-French cognates in listening and reading comprehension in French. Seventy-four tenth grade students in three French classes participated in the study. One class was the control group, one class received training in the phonemic differences of English-French cognates, and one class was taught the spelling alternations on English-French cognates. The experiment was carried out over a period of six weeks. Results indicate that students can be taught the phonemic and spelling differences of English-French cognates in a relatively short time, and it is suggested that teachers use cognates in their French classes. A detailed description of the tests used is provided. (CLK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150859

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alberta Teachers Association
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

English-French Cognates: A Re-examination

by Petra Hammer and
Dr. Madeleine Monod
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta

It has been suggested that English-German or English-Spanish cognates could be used in teaching second languages as a device to relieve"...the burden of remembering words separately" (Chamberlin, 1905:316) and could serve "...as a means of effecting more economical learning of vocabulary" (Johnston, 1939:4). However, investigators of English-French cognates stress their avoidance. "Beware of cognates (false or true)" (Grittner, 1969:92). Charles Fries writes that "practically no words of one language, except highly technical words, ever cover the same areas of meaning and use as those of another language" (Fries, 1945 : 39). Wilkins states that "the similarities between languages may at the same time constitute a danger to any ambition that we may have to use the foreign language with great accuracy" (Wilkins, 1972 : 121).

This wariness of cognates expressed by the above mentioned writers may be explained in light of the empirical studies dealing with English-French deceptive cognates. For example, in order to prevent misunderstandings between the English and French nations which can "...en politique internationale entraîner les plus catastrophiques conséquences" (Boillot, 1956:7) several word lists of deceptive cognates have been compiled. Felix Boillot published Le Vrai Ami du Traducteur 1930. Jules Derocquigny investigated deceptive cognates in 1931 in Autres Mots Anglais Perfides. Maxime Koessler and Jules Derocquigny compiled a wordlist of French-English

FL009258

deceptive cognates entitled Les Faux Amis ou Les Pièges du Vocabulaire Anglais 1946. In the preface of "Des Faux Amis et de la Traduction" one reads:

> Homonymie n'est pas synonymie. ...L'homonymie partielle qui, par définition, excluait toute synonymie dans la langue maternelle, risque d'induire en erreur l'angliciste appelé à faire une version. Il est victime de la ressemblance verbale qu'offrent avec notre vocabulaire certains mots anglais d'origine latine ou française, et ne s'avise pas que la similitude de forme n'entraîne pas nécessairement la similitude de sens (Koessler & Derocquigny, 1946: IX - X).

In 1956 Boillot published Le Second Vrai Ami du Traducteur in which he deals not only with homonyms but words"...qui on la même étymologie mais qui n'ont pas évolué de la même façon dans les deux langues" (Boillot, 1956:7). For example:

français	anglais
salaire, gages d'un ouvrier	salary, traitement d'un homme exerçant une profession libérale
trivial, vulgaire	trivial, sans importance
voyage, déplacement général	voyage, déplacement par mer

It can be observed that the word lists of deceptive English-French cognates compiled by Jules Derocquigny, Maxime Koessler, and Félix Boillot are intended for use by translators. About 500 deceptive cognates are listed and illustrations of cases where a deceptive cognate has been incorrectly translated are included. Koessler and Derocquigny's dictionary of Les Faux Amis provides examples exclusively from translations of pre-twentieth century English literature. However, as Boillot points out:

> Les faux amis sont loin d'être définitivement stables car la signification des termes évolue avec le temps. ...Non seulement le simple jeu du temps mais l'évolution des moeurs introduisent dans le vocabulaire des modifications qui affectent la nature des faux amis (Boillot,1956:15).

Except for its historical and scholarly interest, Koessler and Derocquigny's dictionary has little practical value for second language teaching in the classroom.

Robert Seward published in 1947 a Dictionary of French Deceptive Cognates which is not specifically intended for translators but, as

the author states, "... this list has been made partly as a suggestion to the makers of notes and vocabularies for the classroom texts" (Seward, 1946: 7). Seward observes:

> ...the only way to establish a reliable list of really deceptive cognates is for a number of conscientious teachers, well aware of this problem, to keep careful check for a few years on actual mistakes made because of deceptive cognates, indicating not only frequency, but the seriousness of the mistake: whether it involved a complete misconception or merely a poor choice amongst a number of near-synonyms. To the best of my knowledge this has not been done, but it would constitute a real advance in the task of charting the difficulty of going from French to English and vice versa (Seward,1946:8).

Seward's dictionary could be employed in teaching French as a second language to Anglophones until a glossary of deceptive cognates, such as noted by Seward has been compiled specifically for school use.

The following are some arguments in favor of using cognates as a vocabulary acquisition device:

1 Since the ratio of "good" cognates to deceptive cognates is approximately 11,000 to 950, the memory effort required by students to learn vocabulary could be greatly reduced by the study of cognates.

2. Incorrect use of deceptive cognates is probably the least enduring type of interference between two languages. Francis Debyser in "Comparaison et interférence lexicales" writes concerning deceptive cognates:

> Les listes de faux amis sont amusantes mais ne signalent généralement qu'une faible part, la plus connue, mais, contrairement à ce que l'on croit la moins grave et la moins durable des interférences. ...les effets au niveau du message sont trop perturbateurs pour ne pas être rapidement corrigés (Debyser,1971:53).

3. The acquisition of meaning is a gradual process consisting of progressive discrimination in learning the native language as well as a second one; it is never complete nor is it a simple process. Second language students of French may benefit from learning "good" cognates because not all word meanings are learned at the same time. With partial cognates, or cognates with meanings which overlap in some usages but not in others, an important concept for vocabulary acquisition would be to encourage students to understand that the lexicon for the second language is not totally static. As

Vygotsky puts it: "Thought is not merely expressed in words, it comes into existence through them. The relation of thought to word is not a thing but a process" (Vygotsky, 1962:125). The relationship is a dynamic one. However, as Anthony suggests, students must be cautioned to avoid equating "...all of the meanings of the (French) words with all of the meanings of the English cognate" (Anthony,1952-53:80-81).

By learning how to use cognates, reading in the second language may be facilitated and the time spent looking up unknown words could be reduced. Thus, the student is brought into contact with the target language on a larger scale. This in turn may help him to develop a Sprachgefuhl or sensitivity to lexical appropriateness as well as to structural forms. The vocabulary compiled in Le Français Fondamental is a speech vocabulary, and studies have shown that it may not permit significant comprehension of the written language (Kist, 1962:20). Emphasis on cognates in reading may facilitate the acquisition of a reading vocabulary.

4. Word-ending regularities like the equivalence of the French "-té" and the English "-ty" in words such as "beauté" ="beauty" or "nécissité"= "necessity", can be easily learned by students if the spelling and meaning of the English and French cognates are otherwise the same. Chamberlin observes that:

> The amount of time required at first to master the principles (or rules about the corresponding English-French cognate endings) grows relatively less, in proportion as the number of cases increases to which it applies, until the time may be practically disregarded (Chamberlin,1905:316).

The formation of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs in French could be illustrated with the words drawn from the cognate list and at the same time, by analogy, enrich the student's knowledge of his own language. Goethe said:"He who knows no foreign language does not truly know his own." In more practical terms, Vygotsky notes:

> In his own language, the child conjugates and declines correctly, but without realizing it. He cannot tell the gender, the case, or the tense of the word he is using. In a foreign language, he distinguishes between masculine and feminine gender and is conscious of grammatical forms from the beginning. The child's strong points in a foreign language are his weak points in his native language, and vice versa (Vygotsky,1962:109).

Thus cognate learning can aid vocabulary acquisition in two ways: 1) by enriching the vocabulary in the second language and 2) by complementing the vocabulary of the mother tongue.

5. Another point in favor of using cognates stems from the suggestion made by Patrick O'Rourke in Toward a Science of Vocabulary Development in which he advocates"...a taxonomy of generative combining forms (roots, prefixes and suffixes)" (O'Rourke,1974:108) to be systematically taught for practical word analysis. The acquisition of meaning may be enhanced by knowledge of key prefixes, roots and suffixes. The Greek and Latin suffixes which Jean Dubois(1962) lists in his book Etude sur la Dérivation Suffixale en Français moderne et contemporain are generally as applicable to English words as to French words. For example:

Prefix	Meaning	Example Words
a-,-an	(not,without)	apathy, atheism, aseptic apathie, athéisme, aseptique
bene-	(well,good)	benefit,benediction,benevolent bénéfice,bénédiction,bénévole
Root	**Meaning**	**Example Words**
magna	(great)	magnitude,magnificent,magnate magnitude,magnifique, magnat
med	(middle)	medium, mediocre, medieval médium, médiocre, médiéval
Suffix	**Meaning**	**Example Words**
-or,-er	(one who)	actor,doctor,employer acteur, docteur, employeur
-ism	(belief in)	communism communisme

6. The cultural evolution of the French and English languages could be studied with cognate words. Parallel as well as divergent semantic development of words could be ascertained with reference to cognates, partial cognates and deceptive cognates, because "Les mots sont en effet le reflet de l'évolution des moeurs et des idées" (Gougenheim,1968:7-8). A cultural unit could be built on words. Lexical borrowings, which fall loosely into the category of cognates and are contained in the author's cognate list are, according to Gougenheim:

> ...les témoignages précieux des relations entre les peuples. Il serait vain de chercher quel est le peuple qui doit le plus aux autres: tout dépend du milieu et du moment. À l'époque actuelle, la multiplicité des emprunts dans les domaines scientifiques et techniques tend à créer un certain vocabulaire international qui répond à un des aspects de la civilisation moderne (Gougenheim, 1968:30).

With the advanced knowledge of the lexical comparison for the English and French languages, the study of cognates may be a feasible means to facilitate, enrich and accelerate the study of French by Anglophones. To the best of the authors' knowledge, no comparable experiment has been attempted before.

A study was conducted to find out whether or not pupils are able to utilize English-French cognates in listening and reading comprehension of French after having been taught the phonemic differences and spelling alterations of English-French cognates.

Seventy-four students, comprising three intact Grade X, French 11 classes in an urban public school participated in this study. Senior high school students were selected mainly because secondary students are expected to have on the average a relatively larger vocabulary power than elementary or junior high students. In addition, the discrepancy between the student's maturity level and his ability to understand and/or say what he wishes in the second language could be a source of frustration and dissatisfaction for senior high school students.

One class served as a control group, one class received training in the phonemic differences of English-French cognates and one class was taught the spelling alterations of English-French cognates. Students were not informed about the specifics of the experimental treatments nor that some examinations which were administered during that time were part of an experimental study in order to minimize the Hawthorne effect.

Six lessons lasting approximately 30 to 35 minutes each were presented to the two treatment groups on six consecutive Mondays. The experiment proper was carried out over a period of six weeks not including the pre-and posttests. The regular class teacher administered the pre-and posttests and also taught the material for the oral and written cognate recognition treatment.

Oral Cognate Recognition Teaching Unit

The objectives for the oral cognate recognition teaching unit were, first, to inform students about the existence and properties of English-French cognates, and, second, to provide students with the necessary phonetic knowledge of the French language to facilitate pronunciation and comprehension of English-French cognates.

The instructional material used to achieve these objectives included: a handout including the definition of cognates, 24 English-

French cognate word-ending regularities, and a list of 40 deceptive cognates contained in Le Français Fondamental, Premier Degré, review of the sound of the French alphabet and a handout on the French vocalic system, and two pre-recorded word lists of twenty English-French cognates pronounced in French for which students were asked to guess the equivalent English cognate.

Two instructional strategies were adopted to achieve the objectives: 1) The student was asked to apply his phonetic knowledge of French to the pronunciation of the English-French cognate words in French and 2) The reverse approach in which the student was presented with prerecorded oral French cognate words and was asked to guess the equivalent English word.

Since there are only three phonemes in the French consonant system the /ɳ/, /y/ and /r/ which an Anglophone studying French has to master, but nine French vowels /y/, /ø/, /oe/, /a/, /ɑ/, /ɛ̃/, /õe/, /ɔ̃/, /ɑ̃/, proportionately more time was devoted to the study of the French vocalic system. Since only comprehension of isolated words was dealt with, intonation, rhythm and pitch received secondary attention. Keeping in mind the time limit of the experiment, the emphasis in the teaching unit for the oral cognate recognition group was placed on unfamiliar and differing phonemes in French.

The Written Cognate Recognition Teaching Unit

The objectives for the written recognition of the cognate teaching unit were 1) to inform students about the existence and properties of English-French cognates and 2) to help students recognize written cognates and thereby to increase their passive vocabulary. Recognition, not recall, was the criterion.

The instructional material used to achieve these objectives included the same information on the definition of cognates as for the oral cognate recognition group, five French excerpts selected from Vidéo Presse, a magazine intended for teenagers, and a review of the French noun, verb, adjective and adverb characteristics.

The instructional strategies used to acquire and practice the recognition of written cognates were 1) the presentation of isolated English-French cognates which were defined in French and served to illustrate the sixteen cognate word-ending regularities which were selected for the treatment and 2) the reading and analysis of the French excerpts.

The investigators decided for the following reasons that the definition of the English-French cognates should be presented in French: 1) Grade X, French 11 students gave already had four or more years of French instruction. 2) Practicing previously learned words and expressions is an additional benefit in using explanations and definitions in the target language (Wiens, 1948:17). 3) Since the student is called upon to reason from the known to the unknown, his linguistic reasoning faculty might be developed. 4) Students should start with a clear equation of concepts, not just a meaningless equation of words (Boff & Bull, 1948:5). A translation of the English-French cognate word may be of no use if the student does not know the word in English.

The decision influencing the selection of the excerpts was determined by: 1) the student's comprehension level in the second language, that is to say by his vocabulary knowledge in the target language, 2) the age of the sample, (the French excerpts were selected from Vidéo-Presse, a magazine intended for teenagers),3) the authenticity of the language usage in the excerpts, 4) the context learning situation for vocabulary acquisition provided by the excerpts, and 5) the opportunity provided by the excerpts for practising cognate recognition.

The French noun, verb, adjective and adverb characteristics were included in the teaching unit to provide students with assistance in word analysis. For example, suffixes which determine the part of speech of words do not necessarily affect the essential meaning of the word, e.g., "rapide" is an adjective, "rapidité" a noun, and "rapidement" an adverb. Thus from knowledge of the primary word students could be guided to understand derived words.

The use of cognates in second language acquisition may be regarded as a tool for vocabulary development. Unfortunately, as the review of the literature concerning vocabulary development reveals, research evidence does not point to a single best approach to teaching vocabulary. Weintraub (1968) and O'Rourke (1974) suggest the teaching of roots and affixes, Hartwig (1974) and Deighton (1959) the use of context, and Traxler(1931) the memorization of words.

To develop or facilitate the use of cognates in vocabulary acquisition the linguistic reasoning ability of the student must be developed. The investigators felt justified in combining a variety of techniques concerning vocabulary development and to include 1) knowledge of morphology, 2) word parts (roots and affixes) and 3) context clues to aid in reading comprehension. It should be noted that word part analysis and the use of context clues if taught

in the English language class may be applicable to the study of English-French cognates in French as a second language.

A detailed description of the tests used to measure the effectiveness of the teaching material on oral and written cognates follows.

Oral Cognates Recognition Test (OCRT)

The OCRT was designed by the investigators. Students were asked to match an orally presented French cognate to its English equivalent. Phonetic transcriptions of the English-French cognates were compared in order to ascertain the number of phonemes which differed between the English and French pronunciation and then listed in order of increasing number of different phonemes contained in the stimulus cognate. Items with a difficulty range of 0.25 to 0.80 as revealed in a pilot study were retained in the final version.

Sixty of such items with four multiple-choice English words were randomly divided into two lists of thirty items each, of which part I (30 items) served as a pretest and part II(30 items) as a posttest. The KR20 internal consistency reliability for part I was 0.53 and for part II 0.52. The Pearson product-moment correlation between part I and part II was found to be 0.80.

To determine the content validity of the test the OCRT was administered to 14 university students studying to be French teachers. They were expected to answer each item correctly, which they did. This means that a person with background knowledge of French has no difficulty in perceiving the parallelism of pronunciation.

The OCRT presents cognates in isolation rather than in a linguistic context because of the possibility of confounding the comprehension of a sentence with the auditory discrimination of the word. Essentially, codeswitching is required in the oral cognate test. The student hears a French word, pronounced in French, and has then the choice of matching the word to one of the four English words pronounced in English. Kolers has demonstrated that "Code-switching is inhibitory for production but irrelevant for comprehension" (Kolers, 1966:371). In his experiment the subjects were asked to read aloud linguistically mixed material. Three kinds of errors were observed: 1. phonological - a word was pronounced with the accent of the other language, 2. translational- words were translated into the other language to conform to the antecedent words, and 3. ordinal - syntactic rearrangements were made.

Written Cognate Recognition Test (WCRT)

The WCRT was a four option multiple-choice French sentence test divided into two parts with 30 sentences in each. Part I served as the pretest and part II as the posttest. The syntactic structures of the corresponding sentences in part I and part II were the same. The vocabulary was limited to lexical items contained in the first eleven lessons of Voix et Images de France covered by French 11 students and to the use of selected English-French cognate word-ending regularities (Hammer, 1975). Three sentences with negative or low biserial correlation on the pilot administration were eliminated, thus leaving twenty-seven sentences in each test. The KR20 internal consistency reliability for part I was 0.59 and for part II 0.57. The Pearson product-moment correlation between part I and part II was found to be 0.77. In order to establish the content validity of the test, an associate professor from the Romance Language Department at the University of Alberta read the test and examined the possible multiple-choice responses before the administration.

Quick-Scoring Vocabulary Test

A standardized English vocabulary test, the Quick-Scoring Vocabulary Test (QSVT), designed by the Department of Educational Research, Ontario College of Education for Grades IX to XIII, was also administered. The test consists of two parallel forms: form A and B, each containing 90 items with five multiple choice answers. This test was selected because the vocabulary used in the test was judged by the investigators to be appropriate for the ages of the students in the sample and because the test measures students' knowledge of the meaning of words rather than spelling or some other aspect of vocabulary.

Results and Discussion

Intercorrelations among the QSVT and the two cognate tests were calculated. The intercorrelations for the cognate pretests are presented in Table 1.

For all three groups statistically significant correlations were found for the QSVT and the cognate pretests. The difference in significance levels achieved for the intercorrelations between the QSVT with the OCRT and the QSVT with the WCRT pretests may be an indication, apart from idiosyncracy of the students in the three groups, of different instructional emphasis given to listening and reading skills in their second language studies.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations Among the QSVT Pretest (Form A) and the OCRT and WCRT Pretests Among the Three Groups.

Tests	QSVT	OCRT	WCRT
Group A			
	(90 items)	(30 items)	(27 items)
Mean	53.13	17.21	19.58
SD	13.66	3.25	3.39
OCRT	0.70***		
WCRT	0.44*	0.17	
Group B			
Mean	58.88	18.88	19.44
SD	14.64	4.30	3.73
OCRT	0.47*		
WCRT	0.47*	0.48**	
Group C			
Mean	50.20	18.00	19.52
SD	16.53	3.94	2.47
OCRT	0.40*		
WCRT	0.75***	0.49**	

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$
*** $p < 0.001$

group A, the control group
group B, the written cognate recognition group
group C, the oral cognate recognition group

A statistically significant correlation was found between the OCRT and the WCRT test for group B 0.48 (p 0.01) and group C 0.49 ($p < 0.01$) but not for group A. And intercorrelation between the OCRT and WCRT seems plausible because both tests deal with vocabulary,

particularly cognates. However, the OCRT measures phonetic discrimination and comprehension whereas the WCRT measures reading ability as well as lexical and syntactical comprehension. For the students in group A the intercorrelation of the QSVT and the OCRT was highly significant ($p < 0.001$). Since the correlation between the OCRT and WCRT was not statistically significant, it appears that for group A the aural skill (listening) bears little functional relationship with the reading skill. A possible explanation might be the disproportionate use of listening with respect to reading.

The intercorrelations among the QSVT, the OCRT and the WCRT posttests are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviation and Intercorrelations Among the QSVT Posttest (form B) and the OCRT and WCRT posttests Among the Three Groups.

Tests	QSVT	OCRT	WCRT
	Group A		
	(90 items)	(30 items)	(27 items)
Mean	52.58	17.13	18.38
SD	14.31	3.07	2.86
OCRT	0.49*		
WCRT	0.40*	0.12	
	Group B		
Mean	58.40	20.16	20.80
SD	14.66	3.65	3.26
OCRT	o.43*		
WCRT	0.23*	0.66***	
	Group C		
Mean	50.72	19.48	18.28
SD	16.43	2.86	3.01
OCRT	0.50**		
WCRT	0.68***	0.62***	

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$
*** $p < 0.001$

Group A, the control group
Group B, the written cognate recognition group.
Group C, the oral cognate recognition group.

Table 3

Summary of the One Way Analysis of Covariance
The OCRT Posttest with the QSVT and OCRT Pretests as Covariates

Comparison of the Unadjusted and Adjusted Means and Variances of Group A, B, and C

	Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	Mean	Variances	Mean	Variances
Group A	17.13	9.85	7.59	7.73
Group B	20.16	13.89	9.67	9.40
Group C	19.48	8.51	9.78	4.04

Homogeneity of within group variances X^2=1.52 p=0.47
Homogeneity of within cell regression coeff.test X^2=3.88 p=0.14

Analysis of Covariance

Source	SS	DF	MS	F-Ratio	Probability
Effects	72.21	2	36.10	5.42	0.007**
Cov 1	31.39	1	31.39	4.71	0.03*
Cov 2	131.84	1	131.84	19.79	0.001***
Errors	459.64	69	6.66		

Scheffé Multiple Comparisons of Means

Groups Compared	F-Value	p Value
Group A vs Group B	3.83	0.03*
Group A vs Group C	4.28	0.02*
Group B vs Group C	0.01	0.99

* $p<0.05$
** $p<0.01$
*** $p<0.001$

The analysis of covariance for the OCRT posttest shows a statistically significant main effect at the 0.007 level of significance among the three groups. Both covariates reach statistical significance, the QSVT at the 0.03 and the OCRT pretest at the 0.001 level. The Scheffé multiple comparison of means resulted in a statistically significant difference at the 0.03 level for the control group A and the written cognate recognition treatment group B, and at the 0.02 level for the control group A and the oral cognate recognition treatment group C. Both, the oral and written cognate recognition groups performed statistically significantly better on the OCRT posttest in comparison with the control group.

They are similar to the findings of the cognate pretests. Statistically significant correlations were found for the QSVT and the OCRT posttest for all three groups, but no statistically significant correlation was observed for group B on the QSVT and WCRT posttest. This is different from the intercorrelations of the QSVT and the WCRT pretests.

The assumption that the usefulness of cognates relates directly to the students' vocabulary power in English is not negated by the intercorrelations of the QSVT and the cognate tests. The OCRT shows a consistent intercorrelation with the QSVT test on the pre-as well as the posttests. For the pretests, statistically significant results were obtained for all three groups. This finding does not hold for the intercorrelations on the posttests where for group B, no statistically significant intercorrelation was found between the QSVT and the WCRT. A possible explanation for this finding may be as follows. Group B differed from group A and C in that it had the highest QSVT mean. Consequently, not cognate recognition, but syntactical difficulty may be responsible for the observed lack of correlation of the QSVT and WCRT posttests. Cognate recognition for Group B should not be less than for the other two groups. That the problem may be one of syntactic difficulty, rather than lexical difficulty may be inferred from the mean of the written cognate recognition treatment group. That the WCRT posttest with the QSVT posttest reaches no statistical significance may be interpreted in light of Miller's assertion (if it is correct): "We cannot understand a sentence until we are able to assign a constituent structure to it" (Miller, 1962:751). Epstein, in agreement with Miller, concluded in his study on the influence of syntactical structure on learning that "...syntactical structure facilitates learning separately from meaningfulness, familiarity and transitional dependency" (Epstein, 1962:126). Braun-Lamesch writes that "clear perception of sentence element articulation is basic to comprehension" (Braun-Lamesch, 1962:187). Syntactical knowledge which would enable the student to organize speech into meaningful units was not taught to the written cognate recognition group but appears to be an element in the WCRT.

One-Way analyses of covariance were carried out to determine the statistical significance of differences of adjusted group means on the cognate posttests for the three groups. The results of the one way analysis of covariance on the OCRT posttest with the QSVT and the OCRT pretests as the covariates are presented in Table 3 and for the WCRT posttest with the QSVT and the WCRT pretests as the covariates in Table 4.

The analysis of covariance for the WCRT posttest summarized in Table 4 shows a statistically significant main effect at the

Table 4

Summary of the One-Way Analysis of Covariance

The WCRT Posttest with the QSVT and WCRT Pretests as Covariates

Comparison of the Unadjusted and Adjusted Means and Variances of Group A, B, and C

	Mean	Unadjusted Variances	Mean	Adjusted Variances
Group A	18.38	8.51	7.40	6.10
Group B	20.80	11.08	9.62	8.20
Group C	18.28	9.46	7.47	4.77

Homogeneity of within group variances X^2=0.41 p = 0.81
Homogeneity of within cell regression coeff.test X^2 = 1.59 p=0.45

Analysis of Covariance

Source	SS	DF	MS	F-Ratio	Probability
Effects	73.27	2	36.64	5.89	0.004**
Cov 1	26.78	1	26.78	4.30	0.04*
Cov 2	105.76	1	105.76	16.99	0.001***
Errors	429.47	69	6.22		

Scheffé Multiple Comparisons of Means

Groups Compared	F-Value	p Value
Group A vs Group B	4.66	0.01**
Group A vs Group C	0.00	1.00
Group B vs Group C	4.28	0.02*

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$
*** $p < 0.001$

0.004 level of significance among the three groups. The QSVT pretest used as covariate reaches statistical significance with an obtained probability level of 0.04 and the WCRT pretest covariate attains significance at the 0.001 level of significance. The Scheffé multiple comparison of means resulted in a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level for the control group A and the written cognate recognition treatment group B as well as for group B and the oral cognate recognition treatment group C at the 0.02 confidence level. The comparison of group A versus group C was not statisti-

cally significant. Only the written cognate recognition group B performed statistically significantly better on the WCRT posttest.

The oral cognate recognition group improved statistically significantly on the OCRT posttest after the treatment, as did the written cognate recognition group on the WCRT posttest when compared to the control group. The improved performance on the cognate posttests in comparison with the control group indicates that students can learn the phonemic and spelling differences of English-French cognates in a relatively short time. Thus, the claims made by Chamberlin (1905),Kern(1908), West(1934), Johnston (1939) and Anthony (1953) that English-German or English-Spanish cognates may be used as a vocabulary acquisition device in second-language learning seem to be justified as well for English-French cognates. It was found in addition that the written cognate recognition group showed not only a gain on the WCRT posttest but also on the OCRT posttest whereas the oral cognate recognition group improved only on the OCRT posttest. A possible explanation for this finding could be, as Bazan, concerning the use of the written word, hypothesizes,"...the written word could act as a reinforcer of the utterance heard, since the written symbols might be more familiar to the literate learner than the foreign utterance" (Bazan,1964:343). It should be added that this is, in particular, applicable to languages which share the same graphemic symbols. The more sense modalities are involved in learning a new stimulus or a new vocabulary, the greater the chance may be for memorization.

In agreement with other research findings (Lipton, 1969; and Finstein,1972),the present study shows that the study of the written language has a positive effect upon oral comprehension. With the limited time available to French second language teaching, the emphasis on written cognate recognition may result in the most economic and efficient use of cognates.

In summary, a statistically significant relationship between performance on the QSVT and the cognate tests was found. This is consistent with Limper's(1933) finding that the percentages of correct responses for these French-English cognates increases progressively from Grade IX to first year college students. The possible utility of English-French cognates in French second language learning appears to depend upon a relatively large English vocabulary knowledge.

The results of the present study indicate that students can be taught the phonemic and spelling differences of English-French cognates in a relatively short time. Therefore teachers should consider the use of English-French cognates in their French second language classes at the Grade X, French 11 level.

French syntactical structures were not taught in the written cognate recognition group because emphasis in the present experiment lay on cognates as a vocabulary acquisition device. However, the study of syntactical structures of the French language as well as the verb and tense system of the French language is necessary to facilitate reading comprehension. This is supported by the inter-correlation of the QSVT and the WCRT posttest where no statistically significant correlation was found for group B on the QSVT and WCRT posttest. English-French cognates recognized and understood by students could be used in the analysis of French syntactical structures found in the excerpts. Cognates could also be used in pattern drills, starting out with syntactical similarities of English and French. For example,

"Marie a une radio." Mary has a radio.

"Où est le professeur qui était absent?" Where is the professor who was absent?

When introducing a cognate unit high cognate density excerpts may be recommended for practice in the recognition of cognates. Once students recognize cognates and their meanings in English, French instruction could be individualized. Instead of assigning the same excerpt to every student in the class, a selection could be made according to the student's ability and interest. In this study the oral and written recognition of cognates was separated. However, in French second language teaching, the phonemic and the spelling differences of English-French cognates should be combined.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the critical and constructive comments of Dr. H. Kass.

Bibliography

Anthony, E.M. The Teaching of Cognates. Language Learning, Vol IV, (1952-53), 79-82.
Boillot, F. Le Second Vrai Ami du Traducteur. Editions J. Oliven, Paris, 1956.
Braun-Lamesch,M.-M. Le rôle du contexte dans la compréhension du langue chez l'enfant. Psychologie Français. Vol. VII, No.3, July 1962, 180-189.
Chamberlin,W.A. The Comparative Study of Words in Foreign Languages. The School Review, Vol. XIII, January - December 1905, 315-323.

Debyser, F. Comparaison et interférence lexicales. Le Français dans le Monde, Nos. 78-85, Juin 1971,51-57.
Deighton, L.C. Vocabulary Development in the Classroom. Published by Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University,1959.
Delattre, P. Comparing the Phonetic Features of English, French, German and Spanish:An Interrim Report. Julius Groos Verlag, Heidelberg, 1965.
Derocquigny, J. Autres Mots Anglais Perfides, Vuibert,Paris, 1931.
Dubois,J. Etude sur la dérivation suffixale en français moderne et contemporain. Larousse, Paris,1962.
Epstein,W.A. Further Study on the Influence of Syntactical Structure on Learning. American Journal of Psychology, Vol. LXXV, No.1, March 1962,121 -126.
Finstein, M.W. French for Reading Knowledge -- An Option. The French Review, Vol. 45, No. 2, March 1972, 838-841.
Fries, C.C. Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1945.
Gougenheim,G. Les Mots Français dans l'histoire et dans la vie. Vol. 1, Paris, Picard, 1968.
Grittner, F.M. Teaching Foreign Languages. New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.
Hammer, P. The Role of English-French Cognates in Listening and Reading Comprehension in the Learning of French as a Second Language. M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1975.
Hartwig,R.J. Teaching French Vocabulary. The French Review, Vol. 47, No. 4, March 1974, 720-726.
Johnston,M.C. Cognate Relationships Between English and Spanish Vocabularies as a Basis for Instruction. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1939.
Kern,P.O. The Study of Cognates as an Aid in the Acquisition of a Vocabulary. The School Review, Vol. XVI, 1908, 109-112.
Kist, J.C. Analysis and Critique of a Major Curriculum Study: La Commission du Français Fondamental.
Koessler,M., and Derocquigny,J. Les Faux Amis, Librairie Vuibert, Paris, 1946.
Kolers,P.A. Reading and Talking Bilingually. American Journal of Psychology, Vol. 79, 1966, 357 - 376.
Lado, R. Linguistics Across Cultures --Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1960.
Limper, L.H. Student Knowledge of Some French-English Cognates. The French Review, Vol. VI, 1932 - 33, 37-49.
Lipton,G.C. To Read or Not to Read: An Experiment on the FLES Level. Foreign Language Annals,Vol. 3, No.2, December 1969, 241 - 246.
Miller, G.A. Some Psychological Studies of Grammar. American Psychologist, Vol. SVII, No. 11, November, 1962, 748-762.
O'Rourke,J.P.Toward a Science of Vocabulary Development, Monton and Co., N.V., Publishers, The Hague, 1974.

Sacks,N.P. English Historical Grammar and the Teaching of French. The French Review, October 1954, 57 - 61.
Seward, R.D. Dictionary of French Deceptive Cognates.Bates College, S.P.Vanni, New York, 1947.
Vygotsky,L.S. Thought and Language.The M.I.T.Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972.
Weintraub, S. Development of Meaning Vocabulary in Reading. Reading Teacher, Vol.22, November 1968, 171-175.
West, M.P. Note on the Inferability of Cognates. High Points, Vol. 16, November 1934, 23 - 25.
Wilkins, D.A. Linguistics in Language Teaching. Edward Arnold (publishers) Ltd., London, 1972.